

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/520,435	DIEL, BERNHARD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas M. Lithgow	1724	

All Participants:

(1) Thomas M. Lithgow.

(2) Mr. Casella.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 9 May 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

1 and 12

Prior art documents discussed:

none


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Clarify the language of the claims. See Ex's Amendment. It is noted that claim 12 is considered a multiple dependent claim as set forth in line 3. As such, claim 12 incorporates all of the limitations from which it depends (any one of claims 1 and 4-11).

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


THOMAS M. LITHGOW
 (Examiner Signature)
 GROUP 17.00

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)